

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
ISSUES PRESENTED	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
JURISDICTION	6
BAIL STATUS	6
STANDARD OF REVIEW	6
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	9
I. INTRODUCTION	9
II. BACKGROUND HISTORY OF SMITH	6
III. TRIAL TESTIMONY	13
A. The Testimony Of The Child Witnesses	13
B. The Testimony Of Dr. Bidwell	16
C. The Testimony of Mazepa/Foster Mother	20
D. Smith and Nakamura's Testimony	22
E. The Sentencing Hearing	23
F. Brief Appellate History/Direct Appeal	26
G. Brief Appellate Review/Second Rule 40 Petition	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

	<u>PAGE</u>
ARGUMENT	29
I. THE STATE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED SMITH'S FIFTH, SIXTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO CONFRONTATION AND DUE PROCESS OF LAW BY ADMITTING HEARSAY TESTIMONY WHICH VOUCHED FOR THE CREDIBILITY OF THE TWO CHILD VICTIMS BY A PROSECUTION WITNESS WHO DID NOT EXAMINE THE CHILDREN FOR TREATMENT PURPOSES	29
A. Dr. Bidwell Did Not Provide "Medical Treatment" Or "Diagnosis" To The Children Within The Meaning Of Rule 803(4).	33
B. Even if Dr. Bidwell Could Testify In The First Instance Under Rule 803(4), He Should Not Have Been Permitted To Testify As To The Hearsay Statements Of The Children As The State Failed To Adduce Evidence As To Their Trustworthiness.	39
C. Given The Trial Record, It Was Entirely Improper For Dr. Bidwell To Testify As To The Hearsay Statements Of The Children As To The Identities Of Who Had Committed The Offense.	52
D. The Admission Of Dr. Bidwell's Testimony Undermined The Fundamental Fairness Of The Verdict.	55
II. IT WAS REVERSIBLE ERROR TO PERMIT INTO EVIDENCE THE ALLEGED "ACTING OUT" BEHAVIOR OF THE CHILD WITNESSES AND TO PERMIT THE PROSECUTOR TO ARGUE THAT SUCH ACTS CONSTITUTED EVIDENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE WITHOUT EXPERT TESTIMONY CHARACTERIZING THE BEHAVIOR AS SUCH	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>PAGE</u>
III. THE SENTENCING COURT IMPROPERLY IMPOSED CONSECUTIVE LIFE SENTENCES WITHOUT FOLLOWING HAWAII STATE PROCEDURES AND STATUTES DETAILING WHEN AND HOW SUCH A SENTENCE CAN BE IMPOSED, IN VIOLATION OF SMITH'S FEDERAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS	71
IV. IT WAS IMPROPER FOR THE SENTENCING COURT TO IMPOSE AN EXTENDED TERM OF IMPRISONMENT PURSUANT TO H.R.S. § 706-662(4), BECAUSE THE SENTENCING JUDGE HAD TO MAKE A FACTUAL FINDING THAT AN EXTENDED TERM OF IMPRISONMENT WAS "NECESSARY FOR PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC," A FACT THAT WAS NOT PRESENTED TO NOR FOUND BY THE JURY	81
CONCLUSION	90
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	